Executive Summary

The *Alameda County Congestion Management Agency Countywide Transportation Plan* is the blueprint for transportation improvement through the year 2026 and contains a shared vision of the county's long-term transportation needs.

A SNAPSHOT OF ALAMEDA COUNTY

Transportation is vital to Alameda County – the geographic center of the nine-county Bay Area – and its economy. The county is a global gateway for international trade. Its freeways are the principal trucking routes that connect the Bay Area with its economic hinterland. Oakland, the county's predominant city, is the hub of the BART system. The Port of Oakland is one of the four busiest ports on the West Coast; it is also a primary gateway for the transcontinental railroad system. Extending from the region's urban core to its rural periphery, the county incorporates land uses that range from intensely urban to suburban and rural.

THE COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The Countywide Transportation System includes all freeways in Alameda County; a selected network of roads and major arterials that provide the primary avenues of local circulation; the bridges that connect Alameda County with San Francisco and the West Bay; the metropolitan gateways that connect Alameda County with Contra Costa County and the Central Valley; the county's global gateways, including Oakland International Airport, the Port of Oakland and the railroads and intermodal terminals which serve it; BART, AC Transit, LAVTA, Union City Transit and those major hubs and transfer centers where the transit system of the future will connect with interregional rail service and the freeway system.

The Countywide Transportation System is a byproduct of the separate and distinct histories of the county's ports, streetcar lines, boulevards, freeways, bus routes and rapid transit system. It is the charge of the Alameda County Congestion

What's Happening in Alameda County

- Population in Alameda County increased by 12.9 percent or 164,559 between 1990 and 2000.
- Eastern Alameda County accounted for more than 22 percent of the population increase.
- The number of jobs within the county increased by about the same rate as population, or 12.7 percent during this same period.
- Job growth in Fremont, Dublin, Hayward and Livermore accounted for 73 percent of the increase in the number of jobs.
- The percentage of workers who drive to work alone increased from 78 percent of the workforce in 1980, to 80 percent in 1990.

Management Agency (CMA) to bring all these elements together in a shared vision.

CONGESTION INCREASING

Congestion becomes a transportation problem when it compromises our mobility, the degree to which we can readily travel from place to place. In Alameda County, congestion has increased significantly, but it has not compromised our capability for movement.

Overall level of service for arterials and freeway has dropped, while average speed on them improved in some areas but deteriorated in others. Vehicle hours of delay on freeways—the combined amount of time cars and trucks spent idling—has grown significantly from 44,300 in 1999 to 69,130 in 2000. Average commute time has increased by more than 8 minutes from 27 minutes in 1993 to 35 minutes in 2000, and the average commute length has grown from 15.3 miles one way to 17.1 miles in the same period.

Demographics and travel patterns in 2000 reflect the historic patterns of the 1980's. There was an increasing population, an increasing workforce, a significant increase in the cost of housing, an increasing number of two- and three-worker households, and increasing auto ownership. This was accompanied by growth in the share of workers commuting to suburban employment centers as well as a significant increase in the number of workers who use transit to commute to the urban core. Trucking and goods movement is now a round-the-clock industry—reducing but not eliminating the conflict between commute traffic and freight movement.

Although congestion has increased, it has not impaired urban mobility or job access significantly because:

- Suburban employment growth has brought jobs closer to housing;
- Carpools and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes act as mass transit for long-distance commuters;
- Mass transit provides a quality alternative for those who work in the urban core; and
- The personal computer and telecommunications revolutions enable more people to work at home.

A VISION OF OUR FUTURE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Our vision of future transportation needs is based on five fundamental principles:

1. We should leave the next generation with a transportation system that creates economic opportunities, not economic burdens.
2. The mix of transportation improvements proposed in our plan should reflect the diversity of our population and the geographic diversity of our communities.
3. The transportation system must be designed to accommodate future growth, so the next generation will have the job opportunities,
4. the employment choices and the housing options they deserve.
5. Transportation plans must recognize that both suburban development and urban redevelopment will be necessary.
6. Transportation improvements must be coupled with a commitment to conserve resources and preserve Alameda County's environment.

Our challenges are:

- To articulate the vision of a transportation system that will meet our present and future needs.
- To make the strategic choices necessary to flesh out the vision and lay the groundwork for a long-range investment program that is tailored to fit the diverse needs of our communities and match local conditions, while keeping maintenance and management of the system as high priorities.
- To identify and secure enough funds to implement the plan.
- To establish policy guidelines for the maintenance, pricing and operation of the transportation system to ensure that investment in the system is efficient and productive.

OUR GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

To assist us in the monitoring of the plan's effectiveness, the CMA has established six goals and accompanying objectives.

Improved Mobility

Our transportation system must continue to serve commuters safely and conveniently without excessive delays, accommodate our shipping and distribution requirements reliably and economically; and move traffic safely, swiftly and reliably during most hours of the day.

The Alameda County CMA

The CMA is the county's transportation information and funding conduit. It's the CMA's job to make sure that tax dollars are spent wisely to improve transportation countywide. The CMA board includes representatives from Alameda County, its cities, AC Transit and BART. Technical expertise is provided by staff from these and other local and regional transportation agencies.

One of the CMA's primary functions is to develop the *Countywide Transportation Plan,* a long-range policy document that guides transportation funding and service decisions over the next 25 years, addressing freeways, buses, rail, ferries and other options like telecommuting, bicycling and pedestrian facilities. Transportation projects competing for state or federal funds must be consistent with this plan, as well as with the long-range plan of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

A transportation plan must map the future with broad, bold strokes, but it must temper investment opportunities with financial realities. Without a bold vision, transportation will not attract the investment it requires to serve the needs of present and future generations. Without a disciplined investment strategy, resources will be wasted and additional funding denied. Our goal is to continue to chart the future boldly—while committing resources wisely.

10 Most Critical Transportation Choices For Alameda County

1. How much funding should be guaranteed for the operation and maintenance of existing facilities and services versus that committed to capital investment in new facilities?
2. Should the CMA's investment program emphasize transit improvement or highway improvement? Or should it emphasize street, highway and transit improvements where each is most appropriate.
3. Should transit improvement emphasize the improvement of existing bus service and expanded services that emulate rail and/or electric trolley service in the county where feasible, or should it emphasize the development of long-distance rail and bus service?
4. How can the service provided by BART, buses, light rail and interregional rail be coordinated most effectively and expanded most efficiently?

Greater Transit Access and Transit Use

Transit and other forms of shared transportation must provide congested corridors and major activity centers with a high-quality, attractive commute alternative, dependable countywide access for those unable to drive, and the mix of commute services necessary to become the most desirable transportation option for more people.

Improved Air Quality

We must make steady progress toward the retirement of older vehicles and the development of zero-emission or "clean" vehicles, and avoid undesirable regulatory measures. Our transportation system must enable and encourage an increased share of commute trips to be made by transit, carpool, vanpool, walking or bicycle. We must use HOV-lanes to maximize the efficiency of the transportation system and provide more opportunity to work at home or telecommute.

Efficient Movement of Freight

Our transportation system must provide reliable and economical service for shippers considering a Bay Area or West Coast location and include a highway system which provides the high-quality, high-reliability service required by companies engaged in high-value and/or just-in-time manufacturing. Intermodal connections—linking sea shipping and rail, for instance—must allow the Port of Oakland to compete effectively for discretionary cargo.

Effective Management, Maintenance and Operation

Operations of the transit system should be reliable because maintenance is performed when needed and not later; we accurately anticipate when vehicles will need to be replaced, and we have enough money to operate the system. Streets that are safe and economical to use because they have been maintained and rehabilitated, or fixed, on a timely schedule. Funding for street rehabilitation and transit vehicle replacement should not burden future generations. We must make more or better use of ramp metering, HOV bypass lanes, HOV lanes and park and ride lots.

Cooperative Planning for Transportation and Land Use

We must have a cooperative planning process which engages local government in planning for "corridor management"—of the transportation system and which ensures mutually agreeable and reasonable correspondence between planned development, transportation improvements and required actions to mitigate negative consequences.

Limited Resources

The money currently available to us for transportation—or lack thereof—will not allow Alameda County to create the ideal transportation system. There is a particularly wide gap between what we have and what we need for transit operations, street maintenance and major new capital improvements. We can conserve resources by estimating the cost of projects conservatively; we can manage demand through pricing, land-use management or metered highway operation; or, we can seek additional revenues to finance additional investment. We can reconcile limited resources and critical needs if we are prepared to make strategic choices about the investments we need most, the investments we can afford and how to make up the difference.

A DIVERSIFIED STRATEGY

The quality of transportation service will worsen unless Alameda County pursues a broader range of strategies for ensuring our continued ability to get from Point A to Point B—a plan that uses investment in concert with pricing, road space, transit, system management, and land-use regulation. A diversified strategy is appropriate for Alameda County because it is more cost-effective than investment alone, and because it can be tailored to fit the conditions and circumstances found in each part of the county. The diversified strategy for Alameda County consists of seven component elements:

- An investment program with the flexibility to finance street, highway and mass transit projects—so that each can be employed where it offers the most cost-effective method of transportation improvement;
- A commitment to equity in funding that ensures that each of the county's four planning areas enjoys a level of investment that reflects its share of the countywide population;
- Funding policies designed to ensure enough funding for the maintenance, operation and operational improvement of existing facilities and services;
- Funding policies designed to ensure efficient operation of those facilities that are essential for freight movement;
- Cooperative planning designed to engage city, county, CMA and state authorities in planning for corridor/area traffic management;

5. How can the freeway system be operated more efficiently without burdening major local roads with additional congestion and heavy traffic? What are the respective roles of ramp metering and HOV lanes in the county's primary freeway corridors?
6. How can transportation investment decisions be coupled more effectively with planning for economic growth and community development?
7. How can the movement of passengers and freight be reconciled most effectively? What investments are specifically needed for efficient goods movement?
8. What pricing measures would be most productive in improving air quality and reducing congestion – and which of these would be most acceptable to the public?
9. How much additional revenue is necessary to meet the county's transportation needs and how much are its residents prepared to pay?
10. What revenue contribution should be sought from fuel taxes, sales taxes, bridge and highway tolls and development impact fees?

Corridor/Area Management Planning Principles and Goals

1. Land-use planning is solely the purview of local governments.
2. Concurrent planning of transportation and land use is not intended to usurp or preempt local land-use control.
3. The goal of Corridor/Area Management Planning is to ensure that local governments are involved as full partners in planning for corridor/area traffic management.
4. Local governments, the CMA, MTC, Caltrans, ABAG, BAAQMD and transit agencies have a shared interest in more effective communication about transportation and land use.
5. A cooperative planning effort is necessary to ensure effective management of the transportation system and coordination with land-use planning.

- Planning guidelines designed to ensure strategic treatment of hubs, gateways and intermodal terminals; and
- Pricing policies designed to reconcile mobility and air quality.

Management Strategies

Because the Countywide Transportation System is a system of multiple transportation methods—auto, bus, rail, bicycle, walking—that is managed by multiple agencies, planning, investment and operation must be done cooperatively among these agencies for the system to function efficiently. Better coordination between transportation and land-use planning is needed to ensure that the county's growth can be accommodated without harming the environment. Pricing policies are needed to reduce congestion and accelerate progress toward clean air. Regular updates of this plan are necessary to ensure that it continues to reflect the most appropriate mix of transportation improvements—given changing conditions and the availability of funding.

The CMA will utilize a strategy of system management, including those funding policies, planning guidelines and pricing policies necessary for its implementation. The following management strategies and policies will be implemented:

- Secure funding sufficient to eliminate the maintenance backlog within 25 years.
- Focus investment and system management to ensure that congestion does not impair operation of critical freight routes during midday hours.
- Update the Corridor Management Plans.
- Improve system performance throughout the coordination and the development of major freight and passenger hubs.
- Manage gateways to ensure balanced highway operation.
- Encourage the development of home-based telecommuting programs in the public and private sector.
- Endorse a gradual increase in the fuel tax and fuel sales tax, which have the flexibility to be used for transit improvement and local street and road maintenance.
- Endorse the development of local and statewide policies which: 1) provide tax benefits for workers who use alternative modes to commute; and, 2) provide financial incentives for the use of alternative transportation for commuting to work.

- Endorse further study of pricing mechanisms including an analysis of the economic impacts of congestion pricing. The toll revenues will be reserved to finance the operation of HOV-lane bus service.
- Develop a countywide Park and Ride Facility Plan that includes the location, cost and funding priority for park and ride lots. The plan shall consider opportunities for promoting express transit service where appropriate.

REVENUE

The diverse transportation needs in the county require flexible funding sources that allow transportation improvements and services to be tailored to local requirements. Funding sources need to provide the opportunity to balance investment between maintenance and operation of the existing system and development of new facilities, between older cities and developing suburbs, the demands of commuters and freight movement as well as demands for highway improvements and transit. At the same time, the CMA must assure that each of the county's four planning areas enjoys a level of investment commensurate with its share of the countywide population. Additional revenue mechanisms need to be established—and those mechanisms must match the project and program needs identified in the investment program of this plan.

Federal, state and local funds are generally available for highway construction, improvements and maintenance; local street and road improvements and maintenance; transit capital projects and operating subsidies; carpool and bicycle projects, bridge replacement and rehabilitation, paratransit, congestion pricing and operational improvements using new and advanced technologies.

Funds for freeway, local street and transit capital projects have been easier to obtain than funds for transit operating subsidies. Federal legislation has provided additional flexibility in the programming of road and transit capital funds, but funds for transit operations have continued to decline. Public policies regarding clean air and reduced freeway congestion rely on the availability of transit as an alternative mode; however, funds for maintaining existing services have eroded, and funds for new services have been severely limited.

Corridor/Area Management Planning Principles and Goals ((continued)

6. Cooperative planning of transportation and land-use is intended to ensure that cumulative/regional transportation impacts of local development can be mitigated through local and regional investment and sustained through effective management.
7. Corridor/Area Management Planning should be reached by consensus. A Consensus is considered to include local approval of corridor/area plan even though a local jurisdiction may not subscribe to specific aspects of the plan.

Potential Funding Sources
May be available for both ongoing and new projects and programs:

- State gas tax subventions to local government
- Transportation Development Act (TDA)/State Transit Assistance (STA) revenues
- Bridge Toll Revenues
- Measure B Half-Cent Sales Tax Program
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds
- AB 1107 half-cent sales tax revenues for transit (BART and AC Transit)
- Federal Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)

How Much Do We Expect?

County transportation plans are required to be considered in the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MTC's long-range planning document that covers a 25-year period, from 2001 to 2026. The CMA's long-range plan breaks projects down into "tiers". Tier 1 can only contain projects that can fit into the total amount of funding that the CMA expects to be available from federal, state and local sources over the next 25 years. Tier 2 is based on funds that are not necessarily guaranteed but that are possible. Tier 3 is based on revenues that would be available resulting from new revenues, such as a regional fuel tax and a surcharge on the toll bridges.

MTC has identified about $929.7 million in available revenues for Alameda County Tier 1 projects for the 25-year period. This estimate is based on the assumption that Alameda County will receive $587.4 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding and $342.2 million from federal STP/CMAQ monies. In Alameda County, transit capital shortfalls, Transportation for Livable Communities, MTS pavement maintenance and planning account for $416.1 million, leaving $513.6 available for other projects.

To add to state and federal dollars, Alameda County voters recognized the importance of providing a local contribution to transportation improvements. In 2000, voters approved Measure B, which continued the half-cent sales tax on gasoline. Measure B will generate approximately $2 billion over 20 years. Funds generated by Measure B will be used in Tier 1 as well as for other projects. The County is also expected to receive about $42 million in TDA Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds, $57 million in Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds, $376 million in State Interregional Improvement Program funds and a share of New Starts funding. Local revenues will also provide additional funds.

How Funding is Limited

Unfortunately, revenues have not matched the growth of the population—creating a revenue shortfall. And present revenue sources lack the flexibility needed to respond to changing local needs.

Revenue collections did not keep pace with county population growth because of the California recession in the 1990s and because the state gasoline tax had not been adjusted to account for the impacts of inflation.

Revenue flexibility continues to be a problem because so many revenue sources can only be used for capital investment purposes. A common thread in the review of historical and current fund sources is the availability of dollars for capital investments versus the availability of operating funds. It is far easier to obtain funding to build a road than it is to maintain it, and for transit it is easier to buy a bus than it is to obtain the funds to operate it.

The lack of funding for maintenance and transit operation is, to a large degree, dictated by the types of, and limitations on, funding sources. Some funding sources are specific for highways, for example, or for transit capital projects. Restrictions on fund sources can lead project sponsors and the CMA to make investment decisions based on funding source requirements and availability rather than on need. The result is a challenge to develop and maintain a balanced transportation network that meets the needs of local communities and ensures county mobility as well as regional connectivity.

Equitable Distribution of Funds

In 1992, in order to address the equitable distribution of available funds within the county, the CMA developed a funding equity formula based on population. Funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Transportation Fund for Clean Air, and the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21, formerly known as ISTEA) are divided among the four geographically defined planning areas established by the CMA. The four areas are as follows:

- North County including the cities of Albany, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, Alameda, and Piedmont;
- Central County including the cities of Hayward and San Leandro and portions of the unincorporated area;
- South County including the cities of Newark, Union City and Fremont; and
- East County including the cities of Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore and portions of the unincorporated area.

Funding equity should be achieved over the 25-year life of the CMA's *Countywide Transportation Plan* with a verification and course correction, if necessary, every five years.

Potential Funding Sources
(continued)

- Local fees paid by developers to reduce the negative impacts of their developments on traffic
- Vehicle registration fees for clean air programs, called the Transportation Fund for Clean Air in the Bay Area (TFCA)
- Reauthorization of the federal Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)
- State Environmental Enhancements and Mitigation (EEM)
- State Transportation Development Act (TDA), Article 3 – Bicycle and Pedestrian
- State Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) for specifically identified projects

CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The CMA's investment program represents a series of projects and services intended to maintain and enhance the county transportation system.

The capital investment program serves as the basis for Alameda County's recommendation for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. The investments are presented in six parts: Committed Projects, Tiers 1, 2 and 3, "Blueprint Vision" and candidates for MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program.

Committed projects are those for which funding has already been identified, but construction is not yet completed.

Tier 1 is based on what the CMA reasonably expected to receive from STP/CMAQ/STIP funding between 2001 and 2026, this program totals $929.7 million.

Tier 1 includes funding for the shortfall in transit maintenance and capital replacement. It includes only partial funding for local road pavement maintenance shortfalls and no funding for non-pavement needs such as sidewalks, lighting and drainage. It also includes capital projects that will improve the transportation system in Alameda County.

Tier 2 assumes passage of legislation that would permanently extend use of taxes on gasoline strictly for transportation purposes. The issue will be no the March 2000 ballot. At current levels, an extension would provide an additional $443.8 million to Alameda County during the 25-year horizon of the plan.

Many projects in Tier 2 are additional stages of Tier 1 investments. In addition, several strategic expansion projects are included in tier 2.

Tier 3 is based on new revenues from sources such as a regional fuel tax and a surcharge on the toll bridges—it will serve primarily as an advocacy document the CMA can use in Sacramento and Washington.

Regional Transit Expansion Candidates

The CMA's recommendations for the Regional Transit Expansion Program are show on the next page. These projects are taken from Tiers 1, 2 and 3 and from the Blueprint Vision.

- AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Corridor Bus Rapid Transit.
- AC Transit Enhanced Bus Service in major corridors including: Foothill/Bancroft, MacArthur, University, Alameda, East 14th Bayfair to Hayward, College, Hesperian, Mission, Sacrament/Market, Hollis/6th and Shattuck.
- BART Connector to Oakland Airport.
- BART to Santa Clara County
- Dumbarton Rail
- Livermore Valley rail (final outcome to be determined by study; options include BART, BART, or Altamont Comunter Express Rail expansion).

Relationship of Investment Program to *Countywide Transportation Plan* Goals

The *Plan* and the capital investment program reflect the underlying principle that maintenance and management of the existing transportation system (as opposed to new projects) is of greatest importance.

Approximately 53 percent of the expected revenues has been set aside for management and maintenance of the existing transportation system. Investments that add capacity to the system, both transit and highways, account for 43 percent.

The CMA has proposed a capital investment program that mirrors its adopted policies and demonstrates a commitment to transit, to the reduction of congestion and pollution, and to the maintenance and enhancement of the transportation network. All these goals are important for the individuals and organizations in the region. The capital investment plan seeks to repesent a balanced approach to achieving all of them.

Monitoring

The CMA will use a variety of indicators to track performance of the transportation system over time. They include:

- Average highway speeds
- Travel time for transit, highways and HOV lanes

- Duration of traffic congestion
- Roadway maintenance
- Roadway accidents on freeways
- Completion of the countywide bike plan
- Transit routing
- Transit frequency
- Coordination of transit service
- Transit ridership
- Transit vehicle maintenance